

In the past year, have you considered switching offices or leaving DTSA? If so, why?

Extremely political environment.

Looking for opportunities in a specialized arena for future promotion.

Work-life balance is hindered by inconsistent office coverage.

Very poor leadership in the Front Office.

A general lack of leadership. A very "me or mine" first attitude vice a team goal oriented atmosphere.

Long hours and low morale. I don't feel like I have good options to make changes that would improve the work environment or stress level - at least not in the short term.

Colleagues with increased levels motivation in their work, greater opportunity for career advancement, visibility and acknowledgment for work, more equal distribution of workload, opportunity to work with colleagues that are all equally and actively engaged in the work performed, increased moral.

I have far, far too much work to do. (It has been) discussed with managers for 4 years that it's a bad thing to let the analysts get frozen into their portfolios. (EDITED) (My Directorate) has lost billets and gained work. I feel suffocated by the breadth and depth of work I've been assigned.

I have looked seriously into what seemed like interesting opportunities, but have chosen against moving.

1. The feeling that there are several unhappy people who work in the office and their contribution to the overall work environment makes it difficult to stay positive.

2. Working extremely hard with a heavy and complex portfolio and seeing uneven work distribution among the division.

3. Leadership seems to be extremely distanced from the action officers.

4. With such a heavy workload, annual training becomes burdensome let alone attempting to take a week-long or more class that could actually provide beneficial information that is directly related to my job.

I've thought about switching offices because I was interested in the work they were doing.

[My Directorate] leadership is awful. Director and Deputy Director are not leaders. Do not support their employees. Director is regarded as someone that does not understand issues. Tries to make everyone happy - this is not a leader. Many do not trust the Deputy Director.

More technically challenging work and a position that allows growth, opportunity to travel, and better consistency in mid-level management control.

Ready for something different and no longer desire to be a supervisor.

Sometimes I miss the policy and foreign disclosure work. However, in the long run, I am happy in licensing.

uninterested, uninspired, and self absorbed management

Leadership does not deal with non-performing employees which has created a negative work environment.

To go to a more challenging position.

Although my Directorate values my work I don't feel the organization as a whole value and appreciate what I do. Also, my true desire is to change into another career series

Extremely poor management at the top of DTSA and dysfunctional working relationships at the directorate director levels. Worst management I have ever seen in government. (EDITED)

I believe there is favoritism, and my Directorate Leadership/Supervisor doesn't value the expertise that I and my office colleagues provide.

professional growth

Professional Growth and to gain a greater appreciation for my colleagues in another office.

seeking higher paygrade, feel a glass ceiling over my head

Stopping here: I am not certain that any of these comments will make a difference since these surveys and comments are not operated by professional HR/organizational behavior specialists. The surveys are put out to "pulse" the workforce but in the end, they selectively quote and reference the surveys to fashion reorganizations and delayering to serve a narrow self interest of self promotion and identify people to blame instead of real problem solving.

The work at DTSA is meaningful and challenging. However, DTSA management at the director level is ineffective and poor. (EDITED).

(a) I do not believe our leadership protects our national security equity. It is simpler to capitulate then to fight and make the best argument possible.

(b) The delayer effort is being kept secret and behind closed doors. The "transparency" is simply glimpses into what is going on without any substantive information being provided. I can say that I would leave DTSA if my immediate supervisor was non-technical.

advancement

Chance to have professional growth

Contentious relationship with interagency (especially Commerce) regarding international regime proposals, CJs, ECR, regulation changes. Doubting effectiveness of international regimes and their control lists

Delayering; with particular concerns over establishing super directorates.

Export Control Reform

I believe the office organizational structure, most importantly the respective assigned functions for the various participating layers in the organization structure do not support efficiently and effectively the organization mission.

I believe this organization has a few complete layers that do not have the right qualifications to be positioned in their current roles and assume the functions they currently perform.

This organizational and functional issue has direct consequences in the work quality outcome.

This organizational and functional issue frequently results in raised concerns to be arbitrarily marginalized or completely go unrecognized by the organization management.

This organizational and functional issue also results in overall decent work quality from the only layer of technical experts in the organization to be overwritten or simply ignored, which results in demoralization and the feeling of having no purpose to play, despite the noble and critical mission of this organization.

This organizational and functional issue also prevents and prohibits future self-correction. The organization unknowingly continues to hire unqualified people to perform the duties necessitated under the organization mission.

In my opinion the same issue extends to other DoD entities interfacing with my organization that aid in this organization mission.

The solution: Let's match the right people and the right qualification with the functions REQUIRED and NECESSITATED to successfully achieve the mission of this organization. It starts with the heads of this organization. Let's put TECHNICAL people leading this organization. Let's shift the ultimate decision making to the technical experts based on the fact that this organization handles CRUCIAL MILITARY technology and makes decision that directly or indirectly affect the war fighter! Everyone has an opinion, however not everyone has a qualified opinion. It is time FOR CHANGE!

I have considered leaving due to the lack of opportunities available to grow. Additionally, my immediate management does not support training or anything that results in a day delay in licensing times. It is apparent that licensing times (quantity not quality) is viewed higher than personal development or personal work-life balance.

I really like this current position and enjoy working alongside most of my co-workers, whom are very qualified, experienced, and professional; however, I have a very long daily commute. My duties could be performed at the military base closest to me as was proven beyond a shadow of doubt by the COOP exercise in which I participated.

I was professionally disrespected by my boss. He released my position, then after a phone call from the applicant, he withdrew the position and reassigned it to the most junior member of the team hoping to get a different answer. His actions were heavily influenced by the very broken CJ/CCAT process here in DTSA. Not an excuse but a factor.

Overall - just feeling worn out. The commute is horrible (1.5 hours each way - although luckily I can do it via mass transit), the work is an assembly line grind for what many times just seems to be more government bureaucracy than actual technology security, nearing retirement (2 years) and losing motivation to excel.

Present job does not properly utilize my mathematical/research ability

Professional Development

The interagency ad hoc processes/interactions have become too political. Switching would be to find something where I could actually get things done versus making arguments to deaf ears.
There's a lack of clear direction for the organization contributing to a drop in morale. More often than not, decisions made within the DTSA bureaucracy appear to be arbitrary or self-serving.
New challenges and a change from my current duties to keep me fresh.

What are two things your office could do to improve?

Better teamwork.

Dealing with poor/under performers who refuse to do any work.

>Motivate stagnant employees who are unwilling to do anything but the bare minimum of their jobs to retire.

>Provide my travel opportunities to explain the DTSA mission

1. Convince the RIP's to go ahead and retire so we can hire some new blood. 2. Reorganize.

1. Improve interaction with PD to ensure stronger policy consideration in licenses.

2. Better manage intelligence inputs and get requests for information out sooner.

1. We could have continued training by discussing the "License of the Week" which would be an unusual or controversial license worth discussing.

Communicate when people are going TDY and why. (EDITED) a reference that someone will be out and representing...not a classified or need-to-know issue.

Tell us when someone is leaving or left, to quell gossip.

Equally distribute workload, once the workload is equally distributed poor performers should be dealt with immediately, expectation for all employees to equally contribute towards the mission, visibility for the work performed or lack of work being performed by the team, adopt a 360 degree system or process.

From my suggestions before:

1. Leadership could become more active in interacting with the action officers. More regular staff meetings.

2. Support training opportunities. Ensure supervisors are able to support the absence for training.

Have first level management follow guidance from top level management: i.e. early secures, telework, flexible work schedules (4-10 hour days), etc. First level and Directorate management seems to be able to do whatever they like, even if they disregard/disobey DTSA leadership, just as long as they get the work done.

LD: LO's work together to get job done. TEAM LEADERS DO NOT. leadership does not. long time non productive employee is allowed to continue (EDITED).

Offer telework at least 1-2 days per week

Recognize worker bees (people who actually keep office running) more

replace management

Deal with the poor performers and hold them accountable for their work. Leadership needs to have a better understanding of the missions of our office and empower the team leaders to make sure their team is performing.

More/better strategic communication with rest of DTSA

If Director, MD, had better relationships with other Directors

Team work and more collaboration among workers

1. Either hold less "All-Hands" meetings or make them useful. Numerous working-hours wasted for very little gained in that meeting.

2. Address attitude issues early and directly.

1. Hold everyone accountable

1. Stop rewarding bad behavior: My directorate has 3 long term low performers who refuse additional work and or work that matches their pay grade. [Two] have very small portfolios and refuse to take more work. They just say no when asked and management is afraid to make them do more work. Everyone sees this and it hurts the morale of those who are really busy doing complex work. (EDITED)

Hold more brown bags as "training" sessions

Sponsor in-house training by professionals

Our office has several people with minimal portfolios and that are also low performers. These action officers are carefully handled due to supervisor's fear that the AO will get upset if asked to do more work or do better work. These specific AO's routinely refuse to do work with the work then shifted to AO's willing to continue to add responsibilities to their portfolio. Stop pandering to low performing AO's and require them to accomplish complex tasks commensurate with their pay grade. Stop allowing GS-14/15's to perform like GS-12's just because they are uncomfortable performing higher-grade tasks. #1: Equalize portfolios and expect GS-14 and GS-15 employees to contribute on the appropriate levels. GS-15's with GS-12-level portfolios erode confidence in management. #2: Some in the directorate are allowed broad telework opportunities, while others are discouraged. The response to telework requests or regular days off is always: "the DTSA Director frowns on telework"...yet the front office staff have regular days off and telework opportunities. Encourage telework when possible and encourage regular days off as mission permits. (EDITED)

Restrain office leadership travel; ensure supervisor feedback

Value the expertise of employees.

Recognize the fact that we all do not fit into the same bowl, and we were all hired to address a specific need and that everyone's work is of value.

(1) More morale events (2) Provide more training and travel opportunity

(a) We need to completely change the TD structure. It is not working. We have a division that needs to go away but we are too concerned about feelings, repercussions or reprisals to make the hard organizational choices

(b) We have one person in our office who leaves prior to core hours. No one says anything because we don't want to make that person "upset"

(c) We have one person in our office who is stubborn and unwilling to work with applicants or members from other divisions. However, we insulate this person because we know that this person will immediately file a complaint with EEO and so we all have to "walk on eggshells".

1. Break down to unionization between TD teams.

2. Develop coordination and cooperation between directorates - DTSA feels like two separate entities.

1. Discourage long conversations unrelated to work. Sound travels freely in this office space and these conversations can be distracting. 2. Install sound-absorbing material on the cubicle dividers and walls.

1. Fix the CJ/CCAT process.

2. Offer to reimburse moving expenses for potential hires outside the DC area. We miss out on good people over moving expenses that amount to a few months of salary.

Although many of the technical personnel are highly qualified, there are others that lack the qualifications and the experience to perform the mission of DTSA effectively. DTSA (emphasizing the DEFENSE, TECHNOLOGY, and SECURITY aspects within the title) should [not?] function as a Department of Commerce or commercial pass-through concerning the critical capabilities including the basis technological enablers entrusted by and for the People through the Department of Defense using rubber-stamp APPROVALS. 1.) The ECR and related CJ processes MUST be improved from the TOP of DTSA down to the bottom and across - we are NOT one team, but we should be; 2.) Personnel qualification should better match the requirements of the positions and the position requirements should match the DTSA mission more clearly and appropriately.

DTSA appears very focused on how many licenses are completed in a certain time frame. I think we need a more quantitative approach to what exports are going to each country and the volumes of those exports. USX has a very nice graphical user interface, but there appears to be no way of writing scripts that allow for read-only access of the USX database. The creation of a scripts could allow for easier graphical representation of the USX data and present it in a more quantitative form.

Hold semi-annual meetings to ensure all people understand the TD policy and any changes that have occurred in reviewing technology.

I don't think our office can do the improvement, but the hiring process is inefficient because it is apparently against the rules to specify in detail the skills wanted in a new hire. The emphasis on performance management is overblown and the time required to address performance, assessment, critical elements, etc is time that would be better spent on the mission.

Management should provide relief to overburdened employees and also work cases

morale and teamwork

More training

More communication between directorates

More transparent communication.

Pursue telecommuting or alternative worksites.

Vigorously hold everyone to the same standards.

Address long-term manning shortages

This is a difficult question to answer because so much of the work we do is based on/reliant upon external actions, offices/organizations and the personalities that come with that.

What are two things DTSA could do to improve?

Distribute work more evenly. The strong performers are overworked while the underachievers remain unproductive with less expectations to perform basic functions.

Learn how to manage people and stop being an obstacle to progress.

Trust their people to get the job done they were assigned to do, micro manage less.

-- Have an AI for the each of the top 5 DTSA responsibilities in the DTSA Charter, that specifically details the roles and responsibilities of each Directorate so everyone understands how they are supposed to work together and what product is to be delivered

1. I know how my work relates to DTSA leadership's goals and priorities, but it seems like my work is not actively acknowledged or high in the priority lists of DTSA as a whole. Recognition in LD seems to be lacking, perhaps more outings for appreciation purposes?

2. USXPORTS has been extremely difficult. Try to resolve the speed and maneuverability issues.

1. Use the license review time as a venue to ensure LD's activities align with DTSA's leadership priorities.

2. We need to improve our interactions with AT&L - understand priorities, find common concerns, etc. The same may apply to OSDP as well, however I may not be knowledgeable about the nature of PD's interactions with OSDP.

As a whole, for the entire organization, work prioritization is implied vice clearly stated and as a result, little incentive exists in some office to work collegially or to cooperate in meaningful ways. My own sense is that PD's line of business (rightly or wrongly) takes a higher priority than any other office followed by TD then LD. As a result, there is real perception that the core work, detailed analysis and problem resolution handled every day by LD analysts of all backgrounds and experience is under-valued and potentially marginalized. This could lead to a false perception and imbalance of annual performance ratings considered by the EO.

Comment for my disagree answer. DTSA leadership doesn't prioritize my work. My directorate leadership does when needed. Things DTSA could do to improve: 1. Have a cross-flow rotation within DTSA to allow members to work in another directorate for a year. 2. Have an exchange with outside organizations like DSCA, DDTC, BIS, DOE, USDP so our employees gain broader experience.

DTSA LD leadership and team leaders micro manage and that reflects on their leadership skills. leadership shouldn't have to prioritize our work. they need to treat employees with respect

Improve USXPORTS. Create an UNCLASS version of USXPORTS (like State and Commerce have) to allow working from home.

Inform DTSA leadership that the work of LD is NOT one of those "less important tasks."

IT issues (namely USXPorts) are slow to be resolved, if ever.

It took 10 years for me to be promoted although all or most of my performance reviews were solid 5's and 4's annually. Received many bonuses until change ended. Other workers were promoted after 1 or 2 years.

Leadership needs to have a better understanding of the work our office does and ensure there is an equitable distribution of workload.

Stop Micromanaging and let the people do their job. Build trust in employees and employees work ethics

1. Provide more direct feedback to lower level employees.

2. Hold people/directorates accountable when items are late/lacking quality.

Director should give feedback to AO's and should provide her strategy for the mission. She instead may listen to strategy, but rarely comments or gives clear direction. Director gives rare positive feedback but is very vocal when something is less than expected. This creates an incredible imbalance in feedback. (EDITED)

I believe that there are times actions are accepted that have nothing to do with DTSA's mission/equities.

I don't know what the director's personal goals for DTSA are. She attends meetings and says what she doesn't like--that is the extent of it and that feedback is usually just complaints [EDITED]. She has not presented strategic direction on our efforts. Prioritization--My directorate leadership does this pretty well but we often have to convince the front office to not be distracted by less important issues.

IT needs much improvement; internal office focuses on products/suspenses require review-many cases there is excessive micro-management on it items that lesser importance

(1) More morale events (2) Hiring and appointing better leaders/supervisors

(a) Our tools are outdated and antiquated. First, our internet and USXports have serious latency issues that do not allow us the ability to do our jobs effectively. I would address these latency issues immediately.

(b) We don't have an efficient process. As part of the delayering, we are not looking at the process first but the organizational structure. The structure is irrelevant if the process is not efficient. The org structure should be developed around the efficient process.

(c) The timeout to the login screens on the computers is illogical. This facility is open storage secret. The entire organization has now gotten into the proper habit of removing their CAC and SIPR Tokens whenever leaving their desks so why do these screens still timeout. That needs to go away.

(d) As for priorities, it will always be a "whack-a-mole" organization. We seem unable to develop priorities. Because doing so would mean that some things will not get done. Then when the recipients of those products complain that will become the #1 priority until someone else complains. We can actually accomplish all our tasks if we subordinate the organizational structure to the processes. We cannot because we are personality driven organization.

1. Develop a training schedule, tracking, and delivery tool that is not disconnected and dysfunctional. We are repeating training topics every quarter because of changes and updates.

2. USXports is slow, out of date, and cumbersome. Also, we have no system of record for internal tracking of CFIUS, security review, S&T Agreements, etc.

1. Fix the CJ/CCAT process.

2. Reimburse moving expenses for hires outside of DC.

1. Improve USXports. The search function is pathetic. The application disappears when a .pdf file is sent to print. Few aspects of the user experience are adjustable: The user can't change the size of windows, rearrange them, or modify font size.

2. Fix the CJ process. Items that we agree are CCL but should be on the 600 series often end up on the CCL proper - no interagency CCATS having been reviewed. Put pressure on State to RWA cases where the applicant fails to address all aspects of the "specially designed" definition (e.g., which release paragraphs apply? why?) in the application package.

add S&T agreements, CFIUIS, RFAs to USXports for one stop shopping. Help find technical training sources for less visible portfolios

Delayer sooner rather than later! There are people in certain Directorates getting paid for doing little if any work!

Have an outside audit of our processes since we don't appear willing or able to make them efficient on our own.

Not sure how the day-to-day priorities are ranked by each Directorate.

Recently DTSA leadership met with the Israeli version of DTSA. How does the Israeli version control exports? What would Israel approve and not approve? Is it even possible to find this information?

Some of the tasks do not require our input- they should be prescreened at Front office

There appears to be a very large divide between the activities occurring in the front office and MD versus across the other mission areas. Each of the directorates seem to be put in competition versus cooperatively engaged - us versus them instead of TEAM DTSA in one voice in unison from the TOP down and from the bottom up.

We receive regular feedback on a job well done, but not a lot of quality specific feedback, I'd like to assume everything is top notch? We still seem to be in the everything is high priority mode, perhaps it is.

DTSA is a great place to work. One area that could improve is the delayering exercise. It is taking too long (Dec 2017). It was a good decision to move it faster but the recent delay is going the wrong direction. It would be better to just do it and get it over with. Delaying it is causing some concern within the workforce.

The environment within DTSA itself is, from my perspective, fairly healthy. But in terms of organizational improvements - see previous comment regarding external factors at play.

What is your biggest concern about delayering?

It has no basis in fact only the misconceived perceptions of a few.

My biggest concern is the group focused on delayering. Our HR section is very weak and we should use the opportunity to fix functional deficiencies and not just moving people and supervisors. MD should also be restructured. With better leadership, they should also make sure they have the right people in the right positions and the right amount of people.

Nothing

Unknown

That it will not fix the current cultural and lack of morale in the organization

Uncertainty and lack of clear direction on how to prepare for what's coming.

Also, concern about our mission becoming less visible to external customers.

-- Loss of personnel oversight and accountability- the more people you supervise, the more people will take advantage of being more "hidden."

-- Lack of any explanation of what current mission function we are trying to fix, other than fit enough people u

1. It does not make sense at all. It doesn't save money for DOD. It doesn't allow organizations to configure their structure to best meet their needs. It will result in a bunch of GS-15s limiting their vision to what is front of them, biding their time until they retire.

I do not feel confident that the current delayering team has the necessary skills for the project, and will provide an unbiased assessment of a new organizational structure.

I'd like to know if delayering will still be a mission requirement under the new administration.

It will be "obvious" to leadership that I need MORE, not LESS, work on my portfolio to meet DTSA leadership goals in the Delayering Process.

It's the great unknown. I don't know how it will turn out. It seems there will be fewer spots for promotion.

No concerns. Uncertainty is part of life and adversity builds character. Whatever we have to do we will make it work. However, change for the sake of change is not advisable. Any changes should benefit the organization and enable us to increase efficiency while protecting national security. Major changes should not be rushed.

No issues with delayering; it makes sense. The proposed DTSA-wide reorganization does not make sense and the real possibility is that it will create problems in LD and TD where none exists today. Both understand respective roles and responsibilities and provide mutual support to one another. Simply no major issues warranting or justifying a massive office merger.

None

Not having a clear understanding of the changes in work and how work will be rated (performance)

That LD and TD are going to be combined. This takes away from the independent roles of each organization and makes absolutely no sense. If there needs to be a combining of Directorates than LD should be combined with PD since these two Directorates have the similar goals and functions.

that my lead/supervisor will not have direct knowledge of my performance or abilities or have my work growth opportunities in mind. That a second set of eyes won't be seeing positions before release.

That the LD Leadership is trying to get around delayering in order to keep the LD team leaders in power.

The actual process/result isn't defined yet.

Making sure the right people are in the right roles.

No concerns -- We have an incredible workforce, who will keep the mission moving forward, regardless of how smooth the transition is.

None

not concerned about it.

Should have done it 6 years ago.

VERAs won't be offered/used.

Delayering is being used discretely reorganize DTSA and remove specific directors. The DTSA Director has stated that publicly several times.

Members of the reorganization team are believed to have been offered positions in the new structure. Reorganization is briefed to DTSA staff but DTSA staff involvement is limited; most of the work is being done within oddly formed teams of individuals. ISD refused to participate [EDITED].

Employees will be misplace or misalign in places or with management that either doesn't care or has no interest in the type of work provided to organization as a whole.

Inefficiencies resulting.

informal "team leads" creating new layers
It will be derailed by recalcitrant office directors
Need for consistent and frequent message by DTSA Dir and Dep Dir to all DTSA personnel about how layering will improve our ability to succeed in our core mission areas. Do not think everyone understands the reason for layering or that it will actually happen.
None on the actual layering. Some concern with the angst and rumor mill that has been ongoing since the layering discussion started.
re-organizing based on an arbitrary # of 10 doesn't seem bright. what is the correct number for each office?
Some offices/leaders may not accept the change
that is being done to hide fixing a problem subordinate, that the director already has people in mind for the new jobs and it is being done because the director is unwilling to try to fix her problem subordinate and seeing how that improves DTSA, before reorganizing the whole
Uncertainty!
unfair targeting of cuts and removals
Will everyone pull their fair share of the workload.
It is being implemented before the enough time and thought has been given to how the new org will function.
1) Are we still layering? 2) Who will be my immediate supervisor? 3) When will we merge with Dept. of Commerce?
Distractions leading to poor quality work.
Does not matter what we do- rewards seemed to be predestined
Doing the same as we always do and keeping the same leadership in place with the same mindsets
Don't know what the new jobs will be or who you will be working for
It needs to happen as soon as possible. Delaying it is allowing for people to "game" the process. I haven't heard a legitimate reason for the delay.
The layering committee reps say that nothing new has been done in months.
Lack of transparency and lack of concern about how the day-to-day processes will maintain quality.
Making things work less efficient than what it is now.
merging
None
Non-qualified personnel in inappropriate positions of authority. Lack of TEAM DTSA coordinated organization and communication.
TD being supervised/managed by non technical supervisors
That folks who do not add value to the core processes will be given leadership positions because they cannot really do anything else.
That it becomes a paper tiger where everyone moves around but there is no REAL change in the processes.
That non-technical personnel will be made [first-line?] supervisors over technical personnel.
That we will develop an organizational structure first and then try to develop a process around the structure which is backwards.
The layering may create an organizational structure that is not necessarily aligned with the value stream of the organization.
The secrecy and lack of transparency/updates
This organization has currently critical functional issues. I do not believe that the proposed layering addresses any of that. It may address budgeting issues, however it doesn't address the mission quality which is most important.
In fact the ratio of supervisor - employee proposed under layering will probably have negative effects...
We're already seeing fatigue in DTSA's capacity to hold the line. I believe layering will reduce the ability to say "no" to transfers by bringing the desire to be agreeable with the political natures outside of DTSA closer to the action level.
Will it really make a difference? It's a top-down directed reorganization based on someone's theoretical information regarding boss-employee ratios. And all of us pay the price. Typical government
Taking too long. It appears that several Directors are trying to slow roll the process. It is somewhat concerning that the working group does not have any DTSA Directors as members.
That it could get derailed by certain individuals who focus solely on their own personal motivations and disregard the overall health of the DTSA mission.
That it will not resolve the poor communication and lack of collaboration issues.

What is the biggest opportunity from delayering?

Confusion and disarray.

Greater efficiencies

If done correctly, DTSA has the opportunity to improve its overall functions and capabilities. We should use the opportunity to fix obvious and key challenges not just supervisor and space changes.

Trepidation

Potential for reducing duplication of effort.

To make processes work more efficiently

Aligning more individuals with very similar duties and responsibilities and processes under fewer supervisors within an existing directorate will result in better output and consistent policies and decisions vice micro teams of 2-3 individuals. It will also facilitate better normalization of performance plans and appraisals.

Change.

Creating the most efficient and effective process while installing open minded, supportive leadership.

Equally distribute workload, deal with poor performers, increase management functions of managers to ensure a better and happier work force, decrease analyst functions of managers to free up resources to manage staff.

Get rid on self absorbed managers

I don't know.

I see none. If supervisory ratios are the issues, let large Directorates figure out. Where there may be shortfalls to meeting the criteria, then look at how to integrate with smaller changes vice overall huge reorganization.

I would no longer be a supervisor.

If you make the supervisors "senior" export control analysts, this may open up promotion potential for GS-14s looking for a non-supervisory GS-15 role. This could keep talented people here at DTSA/LD.

individual responsibility

None I can think of at the moment.

None. In fact, it removes supervisory responsibilities and creates isolated operators at the senior level who no longer have the same level of interest in ensuring the operation of the organization as a whole. For those with higher aspirations, it reduces opportunities to meet the requirements for SES.

None. This makes absolutely no sense that Directorates need to be rolled into one another. The goal of delayering (supervisor to employee) relationship can be handled within each Directorate by removing the Team Leaders and having the team leaders serve as seniors. And why this has to be done so fast when the stated goal is 2020 is beyond comprehension.

Opportunity to grow and improve. Increased efficiency. Accountability.

The chance [EDITED] that leadership will give me LESS, not MORE, work on my portfolio to meet DTSA leadership goals in the Delayering Process.

Working closely with other directorates. combining our process so everything is more efficient. TD & LD teams has always made sense. our SOPs should have always been the same. our goals should have always been the same. instead the leadership in LD tried to make TD bend to LD way of doing things. We see how that worked out.

Change

Efficiency.

fresh blood and fresh outlooks within certain positions

Opportunity to update so many things - PDs, missions ops, etc.

Same as above.

VERA/VSIP if offered

agility

Better and closer coordination between "policy" function

Refocusing LD-TD based on technology groups should create more cohesive teams and lead to stronger positions/rationale on all forms of technology transfers, not just licenses, e.g., looking out for emerging technologies that should be controlled.

complying with the 10:1 ratio

Drive a stake into the heart of this multiple DTSA persona

Flatter organization potentially. But the downside is too many staff per supervisor.

getting people who shouldn't be supervising out of supervising

Meet the required 10:1 ratio. This has already been accomplished in some directorates.

More efficiency if done correctly.

N/A

none

Opportunity to seek new leadership that is not dependent upon knowledge but rather management and leadership skills. Also opportunity to seek leadership with creative and strategic thinking skills not based on how it is always been done.

Put in place fresh new directorate level leadership.

Re-focus the organization on the mission sets of DTSA. It seems like 4-5 different entities that do not work well with each other.

Moving some ineffective managers out of supervisory positions.

None
A chance to focus more on the mission of DTSA to protect critical technologies, as opposed to processing licenses.
A reorganization of personnel must also be accompanied by a reorganization of the mission. Trying to do more with less is a recipe for failure.
advancement
Chance to streamline and standardize license reviewing.
Delaying provides the opportunity for better case processing by breaking down the barriers to coordination between LD, TD, & PD. Where is Lean Six Sigma being utilized in this cultural change?
Forming TEAM DTSA!!!
Hiring potentially a new board of supervisors and giving other non-supervisors a chance to compete for those positions.
Hopefully streamlining the process and remove the pigeon holes.
In theory, fewer supervisors should translate into more FTEs doing the work, easing the burden for all. However, the water cooler talk (which could be all wrong) is the various office processes may not change a bit and only the rating officials will be consolidated/changed.
More communication with less teams
N/A
None have been relayed to me.
Not enough information to determine.
Organizational efficiencies that we will likely never get a chance to implement again due to rice bowls.
Re-focus on the technical group. The core to accomplishing the DTSA mission.
Supervisors will actually be supervisors as opposed to them having all the licensing duties of other workers. I think this will allow them to focus on the people working in the organization. Like all office reorganization efforts this really is an experiment. Sometimes a reorganization is followed by another one a year later after realizing that the first one was a mistake.
Tapping into more bodies to move the case load more rapidly.
To develop optimized processes without any preconceived biases based on the old organizational structure and then develop a organization that can support those optimized processes.
To focus on where the work is really being done and making sure the emphasis is properly placed
To stop being a supervisor.
Turn this organization structure upside down and start from scratch. Assign functions to employees based on what they are qualified for. Currently complete layers perform functions for which they have NO QUALIFICATIONS!
Replace non-technical positions gradually as people retire and substitute them with engineers.
It is absurd that in an organization that covers the greatest technology on earth, the ratio of technical experts with non-technical ones is roughly 1 to 3 or 1 to 4. For each engineer we have 3 or 4 non-technical people (or more). I do not have the exact numbers. Why? How is this justified?
Bring in new supervisors from outside the organization could be a great opportunity but it is high risk depending on the reaction from the existing supervisors..
Replacing the division directors for ISD and PD from positions of authority, thereby vastly improving the work environment throughout DTSA - which would thereby improve efficiencies for the sake of the organization and our mission.
We must become one DTSA and provide our Director with strategic, consolidated, and informed products.

How do you feel about supervisors competing for the new expanded supervisory roles?

Abtruse

Do not understand what is wrong with the current supervisors.

Great

I think it is a great idea and would eliminate supervisors who want to work as action officers. The new supervisors can focus on supervising employees.

Conflicted.

I think competition is good

A 360 review system or process should be completed prior to selection of supervisors.

Fine

Gives the opportunity to others that have the desire.....I do not. 6 years is more than enough.

great idea

I only hope that the supervisors who do obtain these positions keep in mind:

1. Work-Life Balance is EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
2. Leadership positions should FACILITATE SUCCESS of their people, NOT push their people down and force their people to only make them look good.
3. Empowered and successful workforce with a healthy, safe work environment that is flexible regarding work-life balance is the key to a successful and happy agency.
4. [EDITED]

I think it is a great idea.

I think most current supervisors will be happy not to compete as they get paid the same without the burdens of supervisory responsibilities.

I would have current directors and deputy directors meet with existing supervisors to find out if they have a remaining interest in supervising if they can maintain the GS-15 grade. Once the billet is vacated it could be considered for downgrading. If, as I experienced a supervisor is clear they no longer want the responsibilities, I would say make a change to the individual's status and notify him or her. For all others, make the tough call & determine who will remain and who will not. Competing the positions seems disingenuous because this is a small organization and Directors should already know who best performs in that role. Re-competing positions especially under a merger will absolutely introduce too many unknowns and risks for the organization that could involve lawyers. Allow LD management for example reorganize and designate its 2-3 remaining supervisors (not including the Director) under delayering and its own reorganization plans. You might be quite surprised how well this will work without upsetting the already fragile atmosphere throughout TD and LD triggered by the announced of a larger reorganization.

is a good idea. it is my hope that the current (EDITED) director does not become the new director of a new TD LD Directorate.

It is absolutely necessary. New roles mean new scope of responsibilities, some supervisors may not qualified and should be required to re-compete.

None.

Re-competing the jobs are unnecessary. It shows a lack of confidence in current supervisors.

stupid

management knows who their leaders are and should assign those who are the best performers

compete later when positions open

That is the prerogative of the Executive Office and I respect whatever the desire is.

Unsure since there are bad supervisors that should have been removed. If leadership uses the same criteria for selecting new supervisors as they do for keeping the existing ones, there will be no improvement, and potentially a concentration or expansion of the power of the poorly performing managers reach/effect.

Whatever.

As long as the most qualified and best person for the job is hired, it doesn't matter who is allowed to compete

Competition is good.

I am okay with it.

Maybe we'll get some good ones this time meaning people who actually want to lead people to accomplish something vice spending all day finding ways to cheat the system.

Necessary for change

OK.

Current supervisors may not have the leadership skills required for the increased span of control an may be better fitted for a Team Chief position

Even the wording of this question is manipulative. "New expanded supervisory roles" will for the most part be adding missions that are very similar to missions already being supervised. One director briefed his subordinate supervisees that they "are all being fired" [EDITED]. The "groundswell" of support for this (limited to a few random comments in the matrix and to the director) comes from supervisees who either 1.: want to be a supervisor or 2.: want to fire their boss. The Director takes this minority opinion as the majority opinion. The issues with this are many. Current supervisors should be moved to supervisory positions that fit their experience and temperament. Most take their supervisory roles seriously and are at DTSA to be professional managers. Removing them from supervisory positions when equivalent positions still exist, and replacing them with new supervisors, speaks to the DTSA Director's lack of confidence in these supervisors and is widely viewed as "firing". These supervisors will then be likely working for current subordinates. [EDITED] DTSA mid-level supervisors discuss this almost daily and resent this proposed action.

Everyone should have an opportunity to make their case as to why they should be retained

Expanded new directorates could be unwieldy with the breadth of responsibilities for the supervisors. GS-15 supervisors will have more responsibilities than DASDs.

Good.

If the job description and responsibilities are significantly different, then it is justified. However, if the responsibilities are the same, not sure it is sensible or proper.

If the roles were significantly different in ways the current supervisor is not qualified to handle, an argument could be made to re-compete. That is not the case and it is therefore widely believed to be retribution on supervisors and a way to fire people quietly. [EDITED] Current supervisors should be given the opportunity to supervise functions that are for the most part the same. If they fail to meet expectations, handle it as a performance issue. This effort will disrupt the DTSA mission for at least a year and will prove to be the director's final legacy at DTSA.

quality of applicants?

Seems appropriate.

Strongly.

they should compete

Agnostic

Are we certain the supervisors are actually going to compete?

As long as qualified individuals are supervising. It is not in our best interest to put a non-engineer in charge of Engineers. A supervisor that does not understand what an engineer does nor "speaks their language" will have a difficult time rating and supervising them.

Competing for what? We don't even know what the processes are and what our requirements are to support those processes so how does a supervisor evaluate us? Against what criteria since our new processes do not exist?

Excellent

Extra burden and expense for this futile exercise. Things may change again in the new administration

Highly encouraged, but not to the detriment of individuals, rather for the BEST formation of TEAM DTSA!!!

I feel it is very fair for them to compete for those new roles. Additionally, my hope is that these roles are available for non-supervisors to compete too.

I have not met a current team leader who wants the role of a supervisor. There is no incentive for increased responsibilities for same pay and benefits.

It beats the alternative.

its going to be interesting

It's probably the best way to get those who are motivated to be in those positions.

May be tough for some, and welcomed by others. Organizational concern is how to find the best person for the mission.

Not an issue.

Not enough information to determine.

Open it up to everyone

Right thing to do.

There is no real alternative. Thirty-ish supervisors competing for ten slots. There would likely be grievances filed if a current supervisor who wanted post-delayed supervisor job was not even considered or interviewed. There will be hurt feelings, but it would be much worse without a fair and open competition.

This should be really great, but I think it's telling that layering is being delayed to allow LD supervisors to gain experience working both munitions and dual-use licenses.

Unfortunately some of the best supervisors will not compete for a new supervisory role because of lack of perceived benefit or they are just tired of the paperwork.

We should worry about the quality of people that are hired and their qualifications.

Current leadership needs to go. Too stale, too long in on position. Hire outsiders if possible, but please choose the people that have the will and the skill to do the job. Honestly this is scarce within this organization. There are few decent people however. (EDITED)

Great!

Neutral. Seems like a good way to get some fresh blood within the organization but it could cause problems within the existing supervisors.

[EDITED]

Please provide any additional feedback you would like leadership to see:

Hold people accountable, trust but verify, advise and guide. (Please note many already do this)

[[EDITED]]

1. I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. I hope to have them annually so leadership can track trends from one year to the next.
2. There is NOT an even distribution of work within the office. I am tasked much more work than my GS-15 colleagues. While, I'm juggling 13 taskers at one time, they are able to (audibly) nap at their desks, leadership giving them "passes" as to why they aren't assigned the same amount of work or more is causing me to sometimes feel overwhelmed. I foresee I will burn out of this position.
3. [EDITED]
4. I wish my achievements were recognized in a more public fashion (e.g. awards ceremony) versus only in our performance evaluations. I appreciate being rewarded for great work via performance evals but I'd also like my peers and the EO to know that. I wish that my leadership felt the same.
5. I do enjoy working at DTSA and believe in the mission. I want to make DTSA a great place to work but for the issues presented above, I feel that it is increasingly becoming difficult to maintain a positive outlook.

DTSA is a great place to work!

Growth opportunities and detail assignments are verbally supported, but not ultimately approved. Flexible work hours are verbally supported, but not ultimately approved. Poor directorate heads are recognized, but not ultimately removed. Etc.

I am amazed at times how some people in DTSA can so easily lose sight of how great a place DTSA is to work. For the most part we are senior government employees doing good work and making a very good living. While at times the work can be challenging and frustrating, the work must be kept in the perspective of how important it is to the national security of this great country. I can think of no greater reward than to go home at night, realize I have done my best, and in my own special way, I have contributed to the safety and protection of a U.S. warfighter.

I commend my senior leadership for always wanting to know the pulse of the organization. It is a courageous and sincere act for which leadership does not always receive credit, mostly because it is not seeking a pat on the back or credit. It is my sense leadership endeavors to communicate clearly with the organization and as a result, puts itself in the unenviable position of receiving feedback that is not always as professional and constructive as it deserves or needs to make meaningful changes.

I don't like the previous question about which directorates are cooperative and professional! There are only a few individuals in a couple directorates who are not cooperative or who are not professional. Everyone else is just fine or even great.

I wish the delayering was staying with the April 2017 completion date instead of being pushed back to end of 2017. Supervisor burn out is a concern.

leaders should understand they are no longer in the military and military rules do not apply to civilians.

That "professional collaborator" set of questions was STUPID! Since it's like asking a construction worker to rate the architects on the quality of their designs, I was disappointed that we were not allowed to opt out of those two questions.

The previous collaborative question was answered with PD in both categories. The reason is SOMETIMES they are great and other times non-responsive or unhappy to have been staffed. It is a case-by-case basis, but usually we get support.

This is my second attempt to complete this survey, so if it goes through, use this version.

DTSA offers many, many of the incentives that are offered by places voted "Washington's Best Places to Work." These include flexible work schedules, TSP matching, career development, family leave, telework (when not on SIPR), plus guaranteed raises through within grade increases. I believe management is offering us every program and option available.

Connect with your people on a personal level--people feel that you think of only yourself in every situation and it is exhausting. Lead DTSA. You are the director--lead us by looking out of us personally and professionally. This will cause people to be loyal to you as the leader.

[EDITED]

Please listen more than you talk--you are highly experienced and highly proficient, but you dominate all meetings and all events. You have amazing people working for you--let them show it and let them shine.

[EDITED]

Recognize those that make DTSA great--they are often not the loudest, but they keep things running.

Rumor says you hate telework and RDO's and you have made comments that seem to support that, yet your staff uses these flexibilities when their type of support job should require the most frequent physical presence. Be clear with your direction on this issue.

Each Directorate has its unique mission and required skill set. This should be recognized and if necessary, explained throughout the organization. Resources should be provided based on mission requirements, not on an "equal share" basis. Personnel grades should be appropriate to the skill requirements of each job, not on some arbitrary "fair share" formula.

Every individual in DTSA, from admin to career 15s, play an important role in the organization.

Each has to see the important role he or she plays within the core missions and how each of the three mission areas complement and reinforce each other..

I am sure many do not understand what other directorates do.

I am not certain that any of these comments will make a difference since these surveys and comments are not operated by professional HR/organizational behavior specialists. They are put out to "pulse" the workforce, but in the end, they selectively quote and reference the surveys to fashion reorganizations and delayering to serve a narrow self interest of self promotion and identify people to blame instead of real problem solving.

I would like to see all levels of leadership to treat everyone fairly and value what everyone brings to the organization.

N/A

None

1. There's a sense that the opportunity to make DTSA a better place to work through delayering is being squandered.
2. There are some obviously incompetent people in the Directorates making important decisions affecting DTSA people and products every day.
3. The health of the organization needs to be improved.
4. The concept of the triad and collaboration across the Directorates is dead.

Getting high participation in social events should not be a major goal of the organization. Some of us are perfectly happy just doing our work and going home!

give some recognition to people who work less visible programs/portfolios

I appreciate the general feedback and thanks provided by leadership. I would like to have more specific feedback/guidance. I can only assume things are all hunky-dory, or maybe that political correctness prevents discussion about being more direct in protecting technology.

I enjoy being and working at DTSA. It is not perfect here but it is a good place to work.

I want to see the very BEST formation of TEAM DTSA and that may need to look VERY different than the current organizational formation, especially concerning taking full advantage of secure technical communications technologies and leadership and management strategies that enable "VIRTUAL CO-LOCATION AND COOPERATION"!!! {Read effective cross-function teaming arrangements, of which the DoD knows a thing or two and optimized for effect over the last two decades.} Again, want to see this opportunity realized to form the BEST of TEAM DTSA!!!

I would suggest that each individual Directorate submit executable plans that meet the delayering objectives and avoid forcing the combination of Directorates into Super Directorates. Super Directorates will adversely affect morale and retention.

It is disheartening to see how many co-workers that I care about being degraded by their supervisors. There are only a handful of supervisors that genuinely care about their team and will risk their own reputation for them. Most of the supervisors just want face time with the front office and will never challenge any bad decision. I seriously hope our executive management is not blind to this that exists primarily in LD and TD culture. I hope change comes soon in the form of new competition of new supervisor roles; otherwise, the agency will lose amazing people that care for their work and the mission to these "bullies".

It's brave of you to put out this survey and I appreciate the opportunity to give my opinion. Thanks!

Noise cancelling headphones. I understand that folks chit chat around the office. Some folks project more loudly than others. Most times the projection carries negative energy because of current events which takes away from my focus on work. Is there any chance we could get funding for these noise cancelling headphones upon request?

The last question about directorates and their ability to communicate highlights the issue with the organization. The question is developed and shows that we have fiefdoms at the directorate level and they stand alone. We don't ask how we as an organization work with other partners (foreign entities, industry, other gov agencies, etc.) but have to worry about how communicate within the organization. If we have to ask that question then we already know we have a problem.

The previous question on collaborative Directorates is written in the absolute which is not really the case. The collaboration issue usually comes down to individuals...who may or may not be influenced by their Directors.

Ms. McCormick and Mike Laychak make a great team and complement each other's strengths and weaknesses.

Could be better synchronization between DTSA and OSD(P) at the working level. That said, not sure how to do that.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.